



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

time and the money to secure the full possession even of a single foreign idiom. The other barrier consists in this: Suppose these difficulties were overcome by members of one or two European nations—what would be the case of the millions inhabiting Asia, Africa and Australia? To the merchant in China or East India, in the valley of the Nile or the bush of Queen's Land the acquisition of a European idiom would be a simple impossibility. But even if, in the course of ages, this difficulty also could be overcome, there remains the choice among the languages that would each and all compete for supremacy in the world. Who would decide among so many equally well qualified rivals?

Volapük, on the contrary, is international in its very nature; like the numerals and musical notes of the world, it also has the stamp of universality, in its marvellous simplicity. Like them it can be understood and used everywhere without meeting a rival, like them it can be acquired quickly, easily and cheaply.

Like all recent inventions Volapük is by no means perfect and complete, not having sprung forth fully armed at its birth, like the goddess of old. Schleyer himself, moreover, is not consistent in his several publications, and his followers—several grammarians even in Germany—differ in more than one respect from their master's teaching. His mode of accenting is not followed by all; while some, simply to save printers the expense of procuring new and costly types, do not adopt the peculiar characters which he has invented for new sounds. All this, however, can do no harm to the new idiom, and may even serve to perfect it beyond the inventor's hopes.

Embittered adversaries of Volapük, enthusiastic admirers of the present forms of speech, have, from the first, asked with great indignation: What is to be the fate of the prevailing modern languages?—They must, naturally, succumb! The accusation is, of course, utterly unfounded. Volapük has nothing aggressive in its nature; it has no desire, and no vocation, to supersede existing languages or to diminish in any way the study of any one of them. Its purpose is not to rule but to serve. Many of Schleyer's most fervent ad-

mirers are content to claim for his work nothing more than eminent usefulness in commercial and general intercourse between the various nations of the earth. Every one is to continue to use and to cherish his mother-tongue, even after having learnt to use and to appreciate the new idiom. The deep historical interest which is the greatest charm of our Modern Languages will only appear more attractive by comparison with this new-fangled, perfectly mechanical offspring of the spirit of our times.

M. SCHELE DE VERE.

University of Virginia.

THE MEISSNER-JOYNES GRAMMAR.

We regret that time and space did not permit us to accompany with a few remarks the review of the above grammar which appeared in the last issue of the NOTES. Certain comments are felt to be due not only to our readers but also to Dr. Meissner, and especially to Professor Joynes, who must in the meantime have been uttering the silent ejaculation: *Herr, bewahre mich vor meinen Freunden!*

Certainly no one will be so inconsiderate as to find fault with Prof. Harrison for exulting over the appearance of a new school grammar destined to release him from "the necessity of swimming over the oceanic speculations of a Grimm, a Diez or a Pott." To less enthusiastic readers, however, who know something of the history of German grammar and grammatical instruction, it appears rather strange that this new work should be represented as marking a new epoch in grammatical literature. It seems indeed to have entirely escaped the notice of Prof. Harrison that the efforts of German grammarians to present to their pupils the appropriate material in the best possible form, have produced a number of excellent books; and that it needed but a skilful and experienced hand to utilize their methods and results for the benefit of English students of German. Dr. Meissner was the first to solve this easy and yet very difficult problem, and accordingly the NOTES were prompt to call public attention in America to his work. (Cf. 'German Grammars and Text-books,' Nov. 1886.)

Judging from the modest and appreciative preface of the American editor, we must believe it to have been altogether contrary to his wishes that his part of the work should be extolled at the expense of Dr. Meissner; and an unsophisticated reader of Prof. Harrison's review will naturally inquire: Why did not the American editor write a wholly original grammar? Why should we import, if the products of our home industry are so much superior? But we, also, in spite of the extended eulogy of Prof. Harrison, believe that the American edition is in some respects an improvement on the original. In other respects, however, our opinion differs, and we beg leave to present briefly the following considerations:

Every one, of course, will agree with Prof. Harrison that it is neither bulk nor completeness which constitutes the excellence of a school grammar. Apart from the general correctness and clearness of its statements, the value of such a grammar depends mostly upon the pedagogical method with which the grammatical material has been arranged and presented. The name of investigator, then, is entirely unsuited to the author of a school grammar, though he may by other productions have proved his claim to scholarship. He is sufficiently to be congratulated, if he has succeeded in presenting according to the fundamental pedagogic law of *Anschaulichkeit*, the grammatical material long since collected by 'investigators,' and if, by this means, he has so aroused the independent activity of the pupil that the grammatical rules become no longer a dead weight upon his memory but are absorbed by him *in succum et sanguinem*.

The elementary grammar, especially, must keep this final aim in view, and we believe that Dr. Meissner, a linguist and educator equipped with the most recent scientific methods, has solved this problem in a masterly manner. There was certainly room for a revision in certain particulars, but the plan and arrangement of the whole was there to stay. Dr. M., however, was mistaken if he flattered himself that his method, and the pedagogical insight disclosed throughout his entire work, were destined to be understood and accepted by the devotees of antediluvian principles of

instruction. The mania of these is the reciting method, their idol the mummy of pre-Pestalozzian times, learning by rote—which makes teaching so drowsily monotonous for the instructor that he grows impervious to the insult implied in the author's directions for his guidance; for his purpose he needs definitions, carefully numbered and with many subdivisions, equally labeled and ready for cramming. The worshippers of stupifying mechanical methods in instruction are at a loss if they meet with a book of which the use presupposes true pedagogical culture on their part, and not merely the skill of a drill-master.

It is evident that most of the praise bestowed by Prof. Harrison upon the improvements of the American edition was inspired by finding these improvements suited to his preference for mechanical instruction; and there is no doubt that the general aim of Prof. Joynes has been to make the original palatable by such treatment. A comparison of the first lesson, on the definite article, will serve as a striking example.

Dr. Meissner says: "The definite article has in the singular three different forms for the three genders, the masculine, the feminine and the neuter. In the plural the definite article has but one form for all three genders." To this the paradigm is appended.—Prof. Joynes, on the other hand, begins by explaining that there are two numbers, four cases and three genders in German,—an addition which we believe to be useful for English-speaking students. But after giving the paradigm, he makes four remarks characterized by him as "important." Yet, is it really necessary to call the attention of intelligent beings to the fact that horizontally the declension exhibits mainly the distinction of gender, vertically the distinction of case, when they find printed horizontally above the paradigm: "masc., fem., neut.," and vertically: "nom., gen., dat., acc."? Is it not an insult to both pupil and teacher, to be informed that only the acc. sing. has a distinct form for each case, that elsewhere the acc. has the same form as the nom., etc.? What is there left by such 'improvements' for the reasoning activity of the pupil to discover? Where is there a place for the development

and direction of such mental activity by the teacher? We could, however, cite numerous cases like the above, in which both teacher and pupil are degraded to the rôle of automata, and we are almost astonished not to find the usual questions printed at the foot of each page, by way of completing the customary puppet-show.

Dr. Meissner's exercises for translation, in intimate harmony with the whole plan of his book, are not laboriously pasted together after the fashion of most grammars, but thoughtfully worked out according to pedagogic principles. The American edition has preserved them almost intact, only numbering them sentence by sentence and dropping those of a local coloring too insular. In various places he has, however, added certain sentences of his own make, and it is instructive to compare these with Meissner's examples.

It would be unjust to Prof. Joynes, after all this, not to mention his genuine improvements on the original work, already duly emphasized by Prof. Harrison. Among these we count, especially, the vocabularies,—although we discover none of the etymological suggestions referred to by Prof. Harrison,—the chapters on the relation of German to English and on German and English idioms, and the elementary introduction to the study of Grimm's law. If the latter, however, was introduced as an attempt at a more scientific treatment, we see no reason why Prof. Joynes should not have given a similar explanation of the Umlaut, since an insight into the historical development of the Umlaut will assist the student even in acquiring a correct pronunciation.—Several mistakes and misprints will certainly be corrected in a future edition.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

ON AN EXPRESSION OF MADAME DE STAËL.

In the last issue of the NOTES Mr. Todd tries to give a correct translation of an expression from Mme. de Staël's writings which is considered as obscure by Mr. W. H. Fraser, the clever editor of Souvestre's *Un Philosophe sous les Toits*. The expression is "un deuil

éclatant de bonheur," which Mr. Fraser translates "a mourning dress, sparkling with happiness," and Mr. Todd "a drapery of woe beneath a glitter of happiness." I beg to suggest another translation, which seems to me to be much more in keeping with the general tone of Corinne's utterances.

Madame de Staël's was a dreaming and passionate soul; she thirsted for happiness and never had it in her grasp. Read *Corinne*, read *Delphine*; the main idea is that glory, renown, power, are all but poor substitutes for that ever fleeing shadow, happiness. The words "deuil éclatant de bonheur" are merely one of the expressions of that ever present thought; they mean that force and power, etc., are, not a *deuil éclatant de bonheur*, but a *deuil de bonheur*, though a *deuil éclatant*. I would therefore offer the following rendering for the puzzling words: "a mournful though glittering compensation for happiness." The expression may seem somewhat paradoxical, but after all Mme de Staël was a pupil of Jean Jacques.

ADOLPHE COHN.

Harvard University.

On second consideration, I venture, with a becoming sense of humor and humility, to suggest that we have all three, Scotchman, Frenchman and American, been grappling vainly with no less simple a problem than that of turning back again into English a rather clever attempt of Mme de Staël's to gallicize the familiar phrase 'a glittering mockery of happiness.' No wonder the publicists and the diplomats distrust re-translations!

H. A. T.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF INITIAL CL and GL in English Words.

The extent to which initial *cl* (*kl*) and *gl* are pronounced as *tl* and *dl* is little appreciated. I graduated at a Massachusetts college under a President who talked about "our dlobe," the "dlory of God," etc. I now sit under the preaching of a man, unusually careful and distinct in his articulation, who speaks in the same way. He had never known that he did this until I called his attention to it. In a small class of mine in Modern English Poetry, three out of four of the members read one of